

## **REMARKS**

Claims 16-45 are cancelled, claims 46-50 are new; thus, claims 1-15 and 46-50 are all the claims pending in the application. Claims 1-45 stand rejected on prior art grounds and upon informalities. Claims 1-15 and 38-45 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101; and Claims 1-45 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections based on the following discussion.

### **I. The 35 U.S.C. §101 Rejection**

Claims 1-15 and 38-45 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101. More specifically, the Office Action argues that claims 1-15 are “directed to functional descriptive material without being in combination with a physical medium, and is considered software, per se, and is therefore directed to non-statutory subject matter”. Applicants have amended independent claim 1 to define “a display adapted to display said set of said resources”. Further, independent claim 10 has been amended to define “a display adapted to display said collaboration space” and “displays said resources to said user”, respectively. As such, Applicants submit that independent claims 1, 10, and their respective dependent claims, define useful, concrete, and tangible results. In view of the foregoing, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw these rejections.

### **II. The 35 U.S.C. §112, Second Paragraph, Rejection**

Claims 1-45 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Regarding claims 1, the Office Action argues that “the relationships between the collaboration

manager, context manager, and view generator are unclear (Office Action, pp. 5-8).

Applicants submit that claim 1 defines “[a] system comprising: a collaboration manager ... a context manager ... [and] a view generator”. Thus, the collaboration manager, context manager, and view generator each comprise a portion of the system.

Furthermore, claim 1 defines that the context manager is adapted to maintain resources; and, the view generator is adapted to select a set of resources.

The resources can comprise collaboration elements of collaboration spaces, which the collaboration manager is adapted to manipulate. In view of the foregoing, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

### **III. The Prior Art Rejections**

Claims 1-45 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by Ruths, et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0018719), hereinafter referred to as Ruths. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections based on the following discussion.

The invention provides a system adapted to enable contextual collaboration within a computer network. In the rejection, the Office Action argues that the prior art of record discloses many features of the claimed invention. However nothing within Ruths discloses that the “collaborative environment” (which the Office Action asserts teaches the “collaboration spaces” of the claimed invention) comprises pointers to the “collaborative platform” (which the Office Action asserts teaches the “collaboration modalities” of the claimed invention). Instead, Ruths merely teaches that the “collaborative platform” is the mechanism provided on a participant to allow that

participant to participate in the “collaborative environment”. Ruths does not disclose that the “collaborative environment” comprises any pointers. Moreover, nothing within Ruths mentions pointers to the “collaborative platform”. In addition, nothing within Ruths discusses the attributes of the “collaborative platform”. Instead, as discussed above, Ruths merely discloses that the “collaborative platform” is the mechanism provided on a participant to allow that participant to participate in the “collaborative environment. In addition, Ruths does not manipulate the “collaborative environment” via commands from the applications. Instead, Ruths merely discloses that the “collaborative environment” is created using applications layered with the collaborative platform on various local environments. Nothing within Ruths mentions that commands from the applications can manipulate the “collaborative environment”. Therefore, as explained in greater detail below, Applicants respectfully submit that the prior art of record does not teach or suggest the claimed invention.

Applicants traverse the rejections because the prior art of record fails to disclose the claimed features wherein said collaboration spaces comprise pointers to said collaboration modalities and attributes associated with said collaboration modalities. Such features are defined in independent claims 1, 10, and 46 using similar language. The Office Action argues that the “collaborative environment” of Ruths teaches the “collaboration spaces” of the claimed invention. Moreover, the Office Action argues that the “collaborative platform” of Ruths teaches the “collaboration modalities” of the claimed invention.

However, nothing within Ruths discloses that the “collaborative environment” comprises pointers to the “collaborative platform”. Instead, Ruths merely teaches that the “collaborative platform” is the mechanism provided on a participant to allow that participant to participate in the “collaborative environment” (Ruths, para. 0051). Ruths does not disclose that the “collaborative environment” comprises any pointers. Moreover, nothing within Ruths mentions pointers to the “collaborative platform”.

Specifically, as illustrated in FIGS. 1-2 and as described in paragraphs 0010-0011 of Ruths, a collaborative platform 16 may facilitate the development and deployment of a collaborative environment 10. New or existing applications may be layered with the collaborative platform 16 on various local environments to create a collaborative environment 10 among multiple participants 14. Each participant 14 in a collaborative environment 10 may include a collaborative platform 16 and an application. Nevertheless, Ruths does not disclose that the “collaborative environment 10” comprises any pointers. Moreover, nothing within Ruths mentions pointers to the “collaborative platform 16”.

Furthermore, nothing within Ruths discloses that the “collaborative environment” (which the Office Action asserts teaches the “collaboration spaces” of the claimed invention) comprises attributes associated with the “collaborative platform” (which the Office Action asserts teaches the “collaboration modalities” of the claimed invention). Nothing within Ruths discusses the attributes of the “collaborative platform”. Instead, as discussed above, Ruths merely discloses that the “collaborative platform” is the

mechanism provided on a participant to allow that participant to participate in the “collaborative environment” (Ruths, para. 0051).

To the contrary, as described in paragraph 0038 of Applicants’ disclosure, a CollabSpace 10 can contain *pointers* to several collaboration modalities and also contain various *attributes* associated with these modalities. However, a user may not need access to all this information for the task at hand. For example, the universe of people participating within a particular contract negotiation process may contain several role players including contract initiator (sales person), counter party (customer), contract administrator, department manager (sales manager), financial analyst, legal expert, etc. However, the buddy list when displayed to the customer may contain references only to the salesperson and the sales manager and no references to the other role players (i.e., financial analyst, contract administrator, legal expert). On the other hand, the salesperson initiating the contract will see the entire set of participants in order to initiate any collaborative interaction with them in the context of the contract being negotiated.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that nothing within Ruths discloses that the “collaborative environment” (which the Office Action asserts teaches the “collaboration spaces” of the claimed invention) comprises pointers to the “collaborative platform” (which the Office Action asserts teaches the “collaboration modalities” of the claimed invention). Instead, Ruths merely teaches that the “collaborative platform” is the mechanism provided on a participant to allow that participant to participate in the “collaborative environment”. Ruths does not disclose that the “collaborative environment” comprises any pointers. Moreover, nothing within Ruths mentions pointers

to the “collaborative platform”. In addition, nothing within Ruths discusses the attributes of the “collaborative platform”. Instead, as discussed above, Ruths merely discloses that the “collaborative platform” is the mechanism provided on a participant to allow that participant to participate in the “collaborative environment. Therefore, it is Applicants’ position that the prior art of record fails to disclose the claimed features wherein said collaboration spaces comprise pointers to said collaboration modalities and attributes associated with said collaboration modalities as defined in independent claims 1, 10, and 46.

In addition, Applicants traverse the rejections because the prior art of record fails to disclose the claimed features of a collaboration manager adapted to support manipulation of collaboration spaces via commands from said applications. Such features are defined in independent claims 1, 10, and 46 using similar language.--

More specifically, as described in paragraphs 0050-0051 of Applicants’ disclosure, the invention includes an interface adapted to allow applications to specify commands to manipulate collaboration spaces, commands to maintain resources and resource interrelationships within contexts, and queries for context-sensitive views. Commands to manipulate collaboration spaces include: managing lifecycles of the collaboration spaces; maintaining membership lists, user profiles, and role associations in the collaboration spaces; adding and removing the collaboration elements; and performing modality-specific operations on the collaboration elements (independent claim 46). The commands to maintain resources and resource interrelationships include:

creating, deleting, opening, and closing of the contexts. The invention adds resources and associations between the resources in the contexts, and then, removes the resources and the associations from the contexts. The queries for context-sensitive views include retrieving resources related to a given context, retrieving resources related to a given resource within a context, and retrieving resources related to a given resource across contexts.

The Office Action argues that the “collaborative environment” of Ruths teaches the “collaboration spaces” and the “collaboration manager” of the claimed invention. However, nothing within Ruths teaches manipulating the “collaborative environment” via commands from the applications. Instead, Ruths merely discloses that the “collaborative environment” is created using applications layered with the collaborative platform on various local environments. Nothing within Ruths mentions that commands from the applications can manipulate the “collaborative environment”.

More specifically, as described in paragraphs 0010-0011 of Ruths, the collaborative environment may span different participants, applications, networks, devices and platforms to provide real-time collaboration. Each participant in a collaborative environment may include a collaborative platform and an application. The application may provide a "window" to the collaborative objects. An application may be the mechanism through which a user views and/or manipulates collaborative objects. The collaborative platforms may provide a collaborative resource abstraction from the participant applications so that the participant applications do not need to include any special collaborative functionality of their own. In some embodiments, an adapter, or any

other suitable mechanism, may provide an interface between the application and collaborative platform. Nevertheless, nothing within Ruths mentions that commands from the applications can manipulate the “collaborative environment”.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that Ruths does not manipulate the “collaborative environment” via commands from the applications. Instead, Ruths merely discloses that the “collaborative environment” is created using applications layered with the collaborative platform on various local environments. Nothing within Ruths mentions that commands from the applications can manipulate the “collaborative environment”. Therefore, it is Applicants’ position that the prior art of record fails to disclose the claimed features of a collaboration manager adapted to support manipulation of collaboration spaces via commands from said applications as defined in independent claims 1, 10, and 46.

Therefore, it is Applicants’ position that the prior art of record does not teach or suggest many features defined by independent claims 1, 10, 46 and that such claims are patentable over the prior art of record. Further, it is Applicants’ position that dependent claims 2-9, 11-15, and 47-50 are similarly patentable, not only because of their dependency from a patentable independent claims, but also because of the additional features of the invention they defined. In view of the foregoing, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections.



## **II. Formal Matters and Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit that claims 1-15 and 46-50, all the claims presently pending in the application, are patentably distinct from the prior art of record and are in condition for allowance. The Examiner is respectfully requested to pass the above application to issue at the earliest possible time.

Should the Examiner find the application to be other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at the local telephone number listed below to discuss any other changes deemed necessary. Please charge any deficiencies and credit any overpayments to Attorney's Deposit Account Number 50-0510.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: August 29, 2007

/Duane N. Moore/  
Duane N. Moore  
Registration No. 53,352

Gibb & Rahman, LLC  
2568-A Riva Road, Suite 304  
Annapolis, MD 21401  
Voice: (410) 573-6501  
Fax: (301) 261-8825  
Customer Number: 29154